



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/695,613

10/28/2003

Lillian R. Paolino

P/113-14

6303

7590

06/08/2010

Philip M. Weiss
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Road
Suite 251
Mineola, NY 11501

EXAMINER

DANG, HUNG XUAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2873

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/08/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/695,613	Applicant(s) PAOLINO, LILLIAN R.	
	Examiner HUNG X. DANG	Art Unit 2873	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/20/10.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 and 16-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Thayer et al** (6,131,209) in view of **Beames** (D 466,543).

Thayer et al discloses eyewear comprises solid frames 60 having a lens; said frame 60 consisting of a one piece solid molded frame; said frames having a nose bridge which fits on top of a user's nose; said frames secured around a user's head by a single band 52; said band 52 secured to said frames 60 by two securing pieces wherein said band 52 is removed from said frame by either or both of said securing pieces wherein Velcro is used for both securing pieces; wherein said band 52 can be totally removed from said frames and replaced with other similar bands. (see at least figure 5 and the related disclosure.)

Thayer et al teach a single lens in the frame, Thayer et al does not teach that a pair of lenses as that claimed by Applicant.

Eyeglasses have long been designed with the general objective of correction the vision of the eye of the wears. Numerous designs of dual lens glasses and single lens glasses have been developed, differing only in aesthetic feature.

Beames, however, discloses the frames having a pair of lenses. Because Thayer et al and Beames are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of aesthetic feature as disclosed by Beames would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Thayer et al.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Thayer et al, with a pair of lenses, such as disclosed by Beames for the purpose of the purpose of aesthetic feature.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by **Sadowsky** (5,042,094).

Sadowsky discloses eyewear with prosthetic parts for small children comprises frame (30) for holding two lenses (20), the frame (the frame 30 is constructed with

resilient material, preferably also soft and pliable see column 3, lines 21 and 22)
secured to a head by a band (40), said band (40) secured to the frames by two securing
pieces (42) including Velcro is used for both securing pieces and the band (40) can be
totally removed from the frame and replaced with other similar band (see figure 1 and
the related disclosure.) Note that solid frame means the frame having the interior
completely filled up and free from cavity, or not hollow.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Laschober (4,930,885).

Laschober discloses eyeglasses with releasable headband support arrangement
comprises one piece solid molded frame (14) for holding two lenses (16), the frame (14)
having a nose bridge (18) with fits on top of the user nose, the frame (14) secured to a
head by a band (28), said band (28) secured to the frames by two securing pieces (30),
wherein the band (28) is removed from the frame by either or both of the securing
means (see figures .1-4 and the related disclosure.) . Laschober discloses the
attachment members are easily attachable to and detachable from the connector
members of the frames and the headband is easily attachable to and detachable from
the attachment members. This allows the wearer to alternate or mix and match

Art Unit: 2873

headbands and attachment members of different colors, patterns or other motifs. (see column 3, lines 47-60.)

Laschober does not explicitly state the lenses are colors as that claimed by applicant. However, lenses are tinted or colored are well known in the art of spectacles for the purpose preventing harmful radiation (ultraviolet radiation) from reaching the wearer's eye. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to make the lenses, of Laschober (4,930,885), tinted or colored for the purpose preventing harmful radiation from reaching the wearer's eye. (Sadowsky teach it provides a new and improved type of **sunglasses** for babies (see column 1, lines 6-10) is cited to support for the well known position.) (Definition of **Sunglasses is eyeglasses with colored or tinted lenses that protect the eyes from the glare of sunlight**)

Response to Applicant's argument

Applicant's arguments filed 5/20/10 have been fully *considered* but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that "Nowhere does Thayer describe sunglasses, nor does Thayer describe that the lenses are colored" This argument is not persuasive because in line 3 of the Abstract of Thayer device clearly states that the device such as eyeglasses, **sunglasses** (Definition of Sunglasses in page 8 of Applicant remark as **Sunglasses is eyeglasses with colored**

or tinted lenses that protect the eyes from the glare of sunlight), goggle and the like. Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the Thayer device.

Applicant argued that "Nowhere does Thayer does it state that this band 52 is replaceable or is placed by other band." This argument is not persuasive. Although Thayer does not explicitly state that the band 52 can be replace by other band as that claimed by applicant. However, one end 56 of the band 52 releasable attached to the eyewear by passing through the slot 62, thus the band 52 can be replaceable or substitute by other band (please see figure 5 and column 5, lines 1-16) . Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the Thayer device.

Applicant argued that "Applicant argues that Thayer teaches a cleaning apparatus for goggles. The apparatus of Thayer requires a compartment 54 having a cleaning cloth contained therein. Since the claims have consisting of language, the combination of Thayer and Beames cannot make obvious applicant's claims.

Applicant argued that "Applicant points to section 211.03 which relates to transition phrases including "comprising" and "consisting of". This section specifically states that the transition phrase "consisting of" excludes any element, step or ingredient not specified in the claim. *In re Gray*, 53 F.2d 520,

11 USPQ 225 (CCPA 1931). *Ex parte Davis* 80 USPQ448 (Bd. App. 1948).

In Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp. Fed. Cir. 2004, the Court held that "consisting of" is a term of patent convention meaning that the claimed invention contains only what is expressly set forth in the claim.

In Georgia Pacific v. United States Gypsum, 195 F.3d 1322 Fed. Cir. 1999. The Court described the MPEP as explaining the difference between "*comprised*" and "consists" as follows.

The transitional term "comprising"...is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additionally, unrecited elements or method steps.

The transitional phrase "consisting of" excludes any element step, or ingredient not specified in the claim.

Based on the MPEP and the case law cited above, because Thayer requires a compartment containing a cleaning cloth, it cannot make obvious with Beames the claims of the present invention. "

This argument is not persuasive because Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which

he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Applicant argued that "Nowhere does Sadowsky teach colored lenses."

This argument is not persuasive because Sadowsky clearly states that "it provides a new and improved type of **sunglasses** for babies (see column 1, lines 6-10). (Definition of Sunglasses in page 8 of Applicant remark as **Sunglasses is eyeglasses with colored or tinted lenses that protect the eyes from the glare of sunlight**), goggle and the like. Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the Sadowsky device.

Applicant argued that "the Examiner states that other similar bands can be replaced with a band. Nowhere is that taught or shown in Sadowsky. It only shows that the same band can be open to be removed from a child's head, but not replaced with a further band."

This argument is not persuasive. Although Sadowsky does not explicitly state that the band can be replaced by other band as that claimed by applicant. However, the band releasable attached to the eyewear thus the band could be replaceable or substitute by other band. Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the Sadowsky device.

Applicant argued that "Applicant points to section 211.03 which relates to transition phrases including "comprising" and "consisting of". This section specifically states that the transition phrase "consisting of" excludes any element, step or ingredient not specified in the claim. *In re Gray*, 53 F.2d 520, 11 USPQ 225 (CCPA 1931). *Ex parte Davis* 80 USPQ448 (Bd. App. 1948) .

In Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp. Fed. Cir. 2004, the Court held that "consisting of" is a term of patent convention meaning that the claimed invention contains only what is expressly set forth in the claim.

In Georgia Paci~c v. United States Gypsum, 195 F.3d 1322 Fed. Cir. 1999. The Court described the MPEP as explaining the difference between "*comprised*" and "consists" as follows.

The transitional term "comprising"...is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additionally, unrecited elements or method steps.

The transitional phrase "consisting of" excludes any element step, or ingredient not specified in the claim.

Based on the MPEP and the case law cited above, because Sadowsky requires the prosthetic pieces, it cannot make anticipate the claims of the present invention. "

This argument is not persuasive because Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Applicant argued that "Applicant argued that "Laschober requires an attachment member adapted for the releasable securement to a connector member. Since the claims require "consisting of" language, Laschober cannot anticipate or make obvious the claims." The Examiner has stated that Laschober teaches every feature of the claimed device, however, the Examiner has not stated that Laschober also teaches further elements that are required which make Laschober not able to anticipate or make obvious the claims of the present invention.

Applicant points to section 211.03 which relates to transition phrases including "comprising" and "consisting of". This section specifically states that the transition phrase "consisting of" excludes any element, step or ingredient not

specified in the claim. *In re Gray*, 53 F.2d 520, 11 USPQ 225 (CCPA 1931). *Exparte Davis* 80 USPQ448 (Bd. App. 1948).

In Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp. Fed. Cir. 2004, the Court held that "consisting of" is a term of patent convention meaning that the claimed invention contains only what is expressly set forth in the claim.

In Georgia Pacific v. United States Gypsum, 195 F.3d 1322 Fed. Cir. 1999. The Court described the MPEP as explaining the difference between "*comprised*" and "consists" as follows."

The transitional term "comprising"...is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additionally, unrecited elements or method steps.

The transitional phrase "consisting of" excludes any element step, or ingredient not specified in the claim.

Based on the MPEP and the case law cited above, because *Laschober* requires the attachment member, it cannot make anticipate or make obvious the claims of the present invention.

This argument is not persuasive because Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the

references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG X. DANG whose telephone number is (571)272-2326. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Mack, can be reached on 571-272-2333. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

6/10

/Hung X Dang/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2873